

**REMARKS**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-14 are pending and under consideration. No new matter is presented in this Amendment.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:**

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Dang (U.S. Patent 7,216,300). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request reconsideration.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 1, it is noted that claim 1 recites “determining whether the applet is a bound applet or an unbound applet” and “if the applet is an unbound applet, immediately issuing predetermined commands to the virtual machine to first set the unbound applet into an initiate state and then into a start state.” In contrast, Dang teaches a method of executing an applet, whereby the applet is initiated **without determining** whether the applet is a bound applet or an unbound applet (FIG. 4, operations 404 through 408). That is, in the entirety of Dang, there is no suggestion of determining whether the applet is a bound applet or an unbound applet, and the method taught by Dang is performed in the same manner for both bound and unbound applets (though in making this argument, the Applicants do not concede that Dang discloses an unbound applet). On page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner reasons that because the system in Dang “can keep track of and execute a plurality of applets,” there is an implied determination of whether the applet is either bound or unbound. However, the Examiner’s expansion of Dang to include such a determination is not supported, explicitly or implicitly, in the disclosure of Dang. That is, **such a determination is not implicit in the maintenance and execution of a plurality of applets**. If the Examiner maintains that such a determination is implicit, the Applicants request that the Examiner provide a reference or evidence in Dang that supports his conclusion that by executing a plurality of applets, a determination is made as to the bound or unbound state of the applets. **Nonetheless, Dang explicitly provides a method that makes no such determination, and is equally applied irrespective of the bound or unbound state of the applet**. Specifically, after the applet is initiated, if another initiate function is called, the method merely ignores the function call irrespective of the bound or unbound state of the applet (FIG. 4, operation 406). Similarly, after the applet is started, if another start function is called, the method merely reopens the already-started applet window irrespective of the bound or unbound state of the applet (FIG. 4, operation 412 and 416). Furthermore, if a stop function or a destroy function is called, the method closes

the applet window or deallocates resources, respectively, regardless of whether the applet is a bound applet or an unbound applet (FIG. 4, operations 422 through 430). Thus, the method taught by Dang is applied uniformly to both bound and unbound applets, with no determination made. The Examiner cites column 2, lines 49-52 as a disclosure of determining whether the applet is bound or unbound. However, column 2, lines 49-52 of Dang discloses an applet that continues to execute when the browser's focus switches to another web page without any suggestion of **determining** whether the applet is bound or unbound. That is, the entirety of Dang, including column 2, lines 49-52 cited by the Examiner, does not suggest any operation of determining whether the applet is bound or unbound. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Dang fails to disclose, implicitly or explicitly, a determination of whether an applet is bound or unbound, as recited in claim 1.

Regarding the rejection of claim 2, it is noted that this claim depends from claim 1 and is, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Regarding the rejection of claim 3, it is noted that this claim depends from claim 1 and is, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above. Furthermore, it is noted that claim 3 recites that if it is "determined by the browser that a markup document connected to the bound applet has a grammatically correct structure, issuing a predetermined command to the virtual machine to set the bound applet into an initiate state." In contrast, Dang does not recite any **determination** of whether the markup document has a grammatically correct structure, as recited in claim 3.

Regarding the rejection of claim 4, it is noted that this claim depends from claim 3 and is, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 5, it is noted that claim 5 recites an application manager that "determines whether the loaded applet is a bound applet or an unbound applet" and "if the loaded applet is an unbound applet, immediately issues predetermined commands to the virtual machine to first set the loaded unbound applet into an initiate state and then into a start state." Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 5 is allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with reference to claim 1.

Regarding the rejection of claim 6, it is noted that this claim depends from claim 5 and is, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Regarding the rejection of claim 7, it is noted that this claim depends from claim 5 and is, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above. Furthermore, it is noted that claim 7

recites "the browser informs the application manager that the markup document connected to the bound applet has a grammatically correct structure." In contrast, Dang does not recite any **informing** of whether the markup document has a grammatically correct structure, as recited in claim 7.

Regarding the rejection of claim 8, it is noted that this claim depends from claim 7 and is, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 9, it is noted that claim 9 recites "determining whether the requested applet is a bound applet or an unbound applet" and "if the requested applet is an unbound applet, immediately issuing predetermined commands to the virtual machine to first set the requested loaded unbound applet into an initiate state and then into a start state." Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9 is allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with reference to claim 1.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 10, it is noted that claim 10 recites a processing of "a markup document classifying tagged applets into bound and unbound applets," and "determining whether an applet execution of the markup document is a bound applet or an unbound applet according to the classifying." Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10 is allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with reference to claim 1. Furthermore, in the entirety of Dang, there is no suggestion of a markup document classifying tagged applets, as recited in claim 10.

Regarding the rejection of claims 11-12, it is noted that these claims depend from claim 10 and are, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 13, it is noted that claim 13 recites "classifying tagged applets of a markup document," and "controlling different execution life cycles of the tagged applets according to the classifying." Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10 is allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with reference to claim 13.

Regarding the rejection of claim 14, it is noted that this claim depends from claim 13 and is, therefore, allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

**CONCLUSION:**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 10/9/08

By:   
Fadi N. Kiblawi  
Registration No. 61,973

1400 Eye St., N.W.  
Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 216-9505  
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510